

Application **DENIED** without prejudice to renew. By **February 14, 2025**, Plaintiff shall file any renewed request to seal the letter filed at Dkt. 45 with any proposed redactions. Plaintiff shall support each redaction with detailed analysis on how the redaction is demanded by "'countervailing factors' in the common law framework or 'higher values' in the First Amendment" to depart from the "firmly rooted . . . presumption of access." *Lugosch v. Pyramid Co. of Onondaga*, 435 F.3d 110, 119, 124 (2d Cir. 2006). The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to terminate the motions at Dkt. 55 and 57.

Dated: February 10, 2025
New York, New York



LORNA G. SCHOFIELD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Re: *Vargas v. Barclays Bank Delaware*
Case No. 24-cv-06549-LGS (S.D.N.Y.)

Dear Judge Schofield:

My firm, along with our co-counsel, Laukaitis Law LLC, represent the plaintiff and the proposed class in the above-referenced action.

This letter serves as a correction to the submission we made earlier today at ECF Nos. 55 and 56. We apologize for any confusion or inconvenience the prior submissions may have caused.

In response to this Court's Order dated January 27, 2025 (ECF No. 50), we submit this letter to re-new our motion to file under seal (ECF No. 44) the letter previously filed by Defendant on January 25, 2025 (ECF No. 45).

A partially redacted version of ECF No. 45 is being filed simultaneously as an exhibit to this letter motion. We request the unredacted parts of ECF No. 45 remain under seal because they provide sensitive, confidential information that could be harmful to the plaintiff if made public. see ECF No. 37. Furthermore, certain of the redacted portions are sensitive because they discuss the reasons that this information should be filed under seal. Accordingly, we respectfully request all sections that have been redacted remain under seal.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael R. Reese

Appendix Pursuant to Individual Civil Rule I.D.3

Defendant and all counsel representing Defendant in this matter who are subject to the Confidentiality Order (ECF No. 37) should have access to the letter filed under seal.

REESE LLP

Via ECF

January 24, 2025

Honorable Lorna G. Schofield
United States District Court
for the Southern District of New York
Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse
40 Foley Square
New York, New York 10007

Re: *Vargas v. Barclays Bank Delaware*
Case No. 24-cv-06549-LGS (S.D.N.Y.)

Dear Judge Schofield:

My firm, along with our co-counsel, Laukaitis Law LLC, represent the plaintiff and the proposed class in the above-referenced action.

We submit this letter in response to Your Honor's January 21, 2025 Order (ECF No. 43) that orders, in part, that "Plaintiff shall explain in the letter how the Complaint at Dkt. 1 complies with Rule 10(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure."

At the time we filed the complaint, **REDACTED**

We are recently informed, however, **REDACTED**

We informed defense counsel – Christina Prusak Chianese and Ian M. Ross - of this fact at 2 p.m. ET today during a follow-up meet and confer telephonic conference.

REDACTED

Honorable Lorna G. Schofield
Vargas v. Barclays Bank
Response to January 21, 2025 Order
Page 2 of 2

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

REDACTED

Accordingly, for these reasons and concerns, Plaintiff believes that he is in compliance with Federal Civil Procedure Rule 10 **REDACTED**.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael R. Reese